

REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 17 and 19 have been amended in the present response. Claims 1-20 remain in the case.

Generally, the present invention is directed to options exercisable by a mobile unit, responsive to a service interruption yielding a suspended call session, wherein the mobile unit can affirmatively initiate or decline reconnection to the suspended call session. The mobile unit initiates reconnection by sending a mobile-originated reconnect (MORC) message (claims 1, 10, 18) or the mobile unit can decline reconnect by sending a reconnect decline message (claims 4, 19). It is important to note, the MORC message differs from a call origination message. The MORC message will be recognized by the network as associated with a suspended call session, rather than a new call. Page 2, lines 13-14. The suspended communication session may have been an originating or terminating session with respect to the mobile unit. Page 11, lines 6-7. Thus, the MORC message may be initiated by the mobile unit that initiated the now-suspended call or by a mobile unit that was a recipient of the now-suspended call. Responsive to the MORC message (or reconnect decline message), the network will conditionally attempt (or not attempt) to reconnect to the suspended call session.

Claims 1, 5-6 and 10 have been amended to more clearly recite the MORC message as associated with a suspended call session, thus more clearly distinguishing over a call origination message which is typically associated with a new call. Amended claim 1 now recites that a service interruption to the mobile unit yields a suspended call session (formerly suspended "call") and the MORC message defines a request for reconnection to the suspended call session exclusive of a call origination. Amended claims 5 and 6 similarly refer to a suspended call session; and amended claims 10 and 17 refer to the MORC message (claim 10) or the reconnect option (claim 17) as being exclusive of a call origination.

Claims 4 and 19, which depend from respective base claims 1 and 17, have been amended to recite that the step of monitoring for a reconnect decline message occurs after the service interruption (claim 4) or the step of sending a reconnect decline message occurs sometime after the service interruption (claim 19). As such, amended claims 4 and 19 more clearly distinguishes over a feature of the Awasthi reference (see below) in which a mobile unit

may issue a command prior to termination of a call that indicates it wishes to intentionally disconnect from the call.

2. Claims 1-3, 11, 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brooks (US 2002/0090947). Claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 17 have been amended in the present response. To the extent the rejection based on Brooks is maintained against the present claims 1-3, 11, 14-18, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, the present invention is directed to a feature whereby a mobile unit may exercise a mobile-originated reconnect (MORC) message to initiate reconnection to a suspended call session. The network monitors for the MORC message and, if it is received before expiration of a waiting period, the network reconnects the mobile unit to the suspended call session. In such manner, the mobile unit may affirmatively request a reconnect to the suspended call session rather than rely on a network-initiated reconnect that may or may not occur. By definition, therefore, the MORC message is associated with a request for reconnection to a suspended call session exclusive of a call origination. The MORC message may be initiated by a mobile that initiated the now-suspended call session or by a mobile unit that received the now-suspended call.

The Brooks reference describes a system whereby a mobile unit that has suffered a service interruption can initiate a reconnection by sending a call origination message into the network. The call origination message is not associated with a suspended call session per se, but is interpreted as a reconnect attempt if it is directed to the same phone number as the original (presently-interrupted) call and if it is received within a designated time window. It follows that if the call origination contains a different phone number or is received after expiration of a designated time, it will be treated as an entirely new call. It is noted, only the mobile unit that initiated the original call may initiate the reconnect attempt, since only the call originator will know the proper phone numbers. Section 26.

Claims 1-3, 11 and 14-18 distinguish over the Brooks reference for at least the reasons that they recite (or depend from claims that recite) a MORC message that defines a request for

reconnection to the suspended call session exclusive of a call origination, whereas Brooks discloses a call origination that is interpreted as a reconnect request under certain conditions.

3. Claims 4 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Awasthi (US 2005/0070286); and claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Moriguchi (US 2004/0203918). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

a. Awasthi is directed to a call reconnection feature that is applicable to telephone systems that have "off-premises call hunting algorithms," such as the case where a call directed to a home office is re-routed to a cell phone and the connection to the cell phone is dropped. With respect to claims 4 and 19, the Office Action suggests that Awasthi may be supply the limitation of monitoring for a reconnect decline message. Respectfully, to the extent Awasthi discloses a "reconnect decline" message, it is merely disclosing a means for a mobile to signal the network that it is intentionally terminating a call and does not wish to be reconnected. As such, the Awasthi "reconnection decline" message must precede the time that the mobile unit drops off from the call. Section 21. Accordingly, even if Awasthi could be combined with Brooks, claims 4 and 19 distinguish over the combination of Brooks and Awasthi for at least the reason that they recite a reconnect decline message that is issued sometime after the service interruption.

b. Moriguchi is directed to a mobile communication device that is able to detect information such as driving direction, geographic position and the like and display certain messages to the driver. In one embodiment, Moriguchi predicts in advance when communication is about to be interrupted (e.g., when the driver is about to drive under a bridge) and conversely, predicts when service can be resumed after an interruption of service. With respect to claim 13, the Office Action suggests that Moriguchi may supply the limitation of displaying reconnect options to a user, the reconnect options including a MORC option; and monitoring for user selection of the MORC option. Respectfully, however, even though Moriguchi may be

characterized as displaying reconnect information to a user, it does not display user-selectable reconnect options, not to mention a MORC option and does not monitor for user selection of a reconnect option. To the extent Moriguchi describes reconnection of a communication session after an interruption of service, reconnection is initiated by "connection unit 115b" (see Section 196 and FIG. 14), which is an infrastructure device, not the mobile unit. Accordingly, even if Moriguchi could be combined with Brooks, claim 13 distinguishes over the combination of Brooks and Moriguchi for at least the reason that it recites displaying reconnect options to a user, the reconnect options including a mobile-originated reconnect (MORC) option.

4. Claims 5-9 and 11 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant chooses to defer amending claims 5-9 and 11, if at all, until resolution of base claims 1 and 10.

5. In view of the above amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration of this application and a notice of allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Steven R. Santema
Steven R. Santema
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,156
Phone: (630) 979-7006

Date: 1-24-2006

Send all correspondence to:
Docket Coordinator
Lucent Technologies
Room 3J-219
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733

Florky 8-2-9-16-2

11